

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These amendments and remarks are in response to the Office Action dated February 15, 2005. Claims 1-46 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 18, 23, 26, 29, 38, 43, 44, 45, and 46 have been amended. Claims 3, 14, 25 and 42 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-41 and 43-46 remain pending.

Objections and the Specification

The Examiner objected to the Specification because of an informality relating to a referenced patent. Applicants have amended the Specification to indicate the patent number of the referenced patent and that the referenced patent is assigned to the assignee of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's objection has been overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 34-37 are allowed.

Amended Claims

Applicants amended independent claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claims 3, 14, 25 and 42, respectively. Claims 3, 14, 25 and 42 have been cancelled. Moreover, the preambles of claims 12 and 45 were amended to recited a "computer readable medium containing program instructions for ...," thereby overcoming the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Dependent claims 4, 7, 15, 18, 26, 29, and 43 were amended to correct claim dependencies due to the cancellation of claims. No new matter has been presented and the scope of the claim has not been altered.

The Present Invention

The present invention relates to creating a user customized resume web page using an online guided resume creation system, whereby the user can dynamically change the resume style with a single command. The style of a resume refers to its appearance, i.e. its look and feel.

Each resume style projects a different "look and feel" by utilizing different formatting

parameters, which include margin settings, font type, font size, and text justification, and the different styles can be iteratively applied to the user's resume until the user finds the appropriate one.

According to the present invention, resume data collected from the user is stored separately from the style data. In a preferred embodiment, the user data is stored in a database, while the style data are implemented as style sheets. To create a resume, the user enters his or her information and the data is stored in the database. When the user selects a particular resume style, the selected style is applied to the user-supplied data and then displayed. The user may then choose a different style to apply to the data, or alternatively, the user may customize a style by adjusting the settings of the formatting parameters for particular elements of the resume, such as name, address, section titles, etc. Thus, for instance, the user can modify the appearance of those elements by changing the font size or line spacing.

Through aspects of the present invention, the user can customize the style of his or her online resume. For example, the user is not locked into any particular resume style and can select different section names, headings or categories to suit his or her preferences. Further, the user can alter the order in which the sections appear and can customize the look and feel of the resume by formatting the data entered, e.g., italicizing certain phrases or boldfacing headings. Moreover, because the user information is stored separately from the style data, the user can dynamically switch from one resume style to another resume style without having to reenter his or her information. Therefore, the user can review several different styles and choose the most appealing style.

Claim Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over The Right Resume (developed by Whirlwind Technologies)

in view of BrightRays.com (http://brightrays.com/web_res2.htm) (BrightRays) and in view of Stylesheet Cookbook by Steve Knoblock (Cookbook). Claims 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over The Right Resume in view of BrightRays.com (http://brightrays.com/web_res2.htm). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46 are allowable because none of the references teaches or suggests mapping the user information to a plurality of fields in a database and storing the mapped user information in the database. In the present invention, the online resume creation system includes at least one database that stores information entered by the user during the resume creation process. During this process, the user enters information into fields that are mapped to corresponding fields in the database. The user information provided is then stored in the respective fields in the database and used to create the structured format file from which the resume file is generated.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states:

[A]lthough Right Resume teaches a “Contact Manager” database for storage of employer contact information, etc. (Right Resume pages 20-21, 39), said database does not deal with the actual mapping of resume data itself. However, BrightRays teaches an online Web resume creation method comprising directions for guiding/prompting a user to input various information, said information used to create a viewable online HTML resume to be indexed in a database, said indexing involving direct association with a database and resume user data (i.e. required inputted keywords for <META> tag inclusion, and searching) (BrightRays pages 1-3, see also page 4).

Applicants respectfully submit that the database in BrightRays is a database search engine (page 4). The database search engine is used to search for potential candidates. The user is asked to enter keywords describing his or her qualifications, and the keywords are used to index the user’s resume in the database search engine. The keywords and other information required to index the resume (page 4) are separate and independent from the information in the information

provided in the user's resume. Indeed, the keywords used to index the resume are not considered part of the body of the resume, which is entered separately (e.g., page 2) during the resume creation process.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the references, singularly or in combination, teach or suggest "mapping the user information to the plurality of fields in the database; and storing the mapped user information in the database," as recited in claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46. Claims 2, 4-11, 13, 15-22, 24, 26-37, 39-41 and 43 depend from independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 38, respectively, and for the same reasons are allowable over the cited references.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion, teaching or motivation to combine the teachings of The Right Resume with those of BrightRays and the Cookbook in the manner claimed by claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46. In particular, there is no suggestion or motivation to convert The Right Resume software package into an online resume creation system via BrightRays and The Cookbook.

A patent claim is obvious when the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art "are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art." 35 U.S.C. § 103; see also *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 14, 86 S.Ct. 684, 15 L. Ed. 2d 545 (1966); *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 998 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Obviousness is based on several factors, namely: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art; (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the teachings of the prior art; and (4) the extent of any objective indicia of non-obviousness. See *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17-18.

When obviousness is based on the teachings of multiple prior art references, the Examiner must establish some “suggestion, teaching, or motivation” that would have led a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the relevant prior art teachings in the manner claimed. See *Tec Air, Inc. v. Denso Mfg. Mich. Inc.*, 192 F.3d 1353, 1359-60 (Fed. Cir. 1999); *Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 1568, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996). “The reason, suggestion, or motivation to combine [prior art references] may be found explicitly or implicitly: 1) in the prior art references themselves; 2) in the knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art that certain references, or disclosures in those references, are of special interest or importance in the field; or 3) from the nature of the problem to be solved, ‘leading inventors to look to references relating to possible solutions to that problem.’” *Ruiz v. A.B. Chance Co.*, 234 F.3d 654, 665 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (quoting *Pro-Mold*, 75 F.3d at 1572). “Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references.” *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d at 999; see also *Ruiz*, 234 F.3d at 665 (explaining that the temptation to engage in impermissible hindsight is especially strong with seemingly simple mechanical inventions). This is because “[c]ombining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor’s disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability—the essence of hindsight.” *Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d at 999.

Therefore, the Federal Circuit has consistently held that a person of ordinary skill in the art must not only have had some motivation to combine the prior art teachings, but some motivation to combine the prior art teachings in the particular manner claimed. See, e.g., *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“Particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these

components for combination in the manner claimed.”); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“In other words, the examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited prior art references for combination in the manner claimed.”)

Here, Applicants respectfully submit that the required suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the cited references in the manner claimed by claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46 is lacking. The Right Resume is a career development software package that resides on a user’s PC. The software package includes a resume creation module that utilizes a word processing application (Page 4 of The Right Resume), along with a contact manager database for tracking potential employers, contacts, etc., a calendar tool, and a mail merge tool.

BrightRays is directed to an online resume service that allows a user to create a resume, to index the resume in a database search engine, and to search key terms in the resumes. In BrightRays, the user is allowed to enter his or her resume information only once and from that, a resume template is generated (page 1, BrightRays). If the user makes a mistake, the user must contact the website administrator to reset the filename.

The Cookbook is a tutorial on how to create a style sheet for an HTML document. An HTML resume is used as an exemplary document to which the style sheet is applied. The Cookbook explains how to define the style of an element in a document.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to convert The Right Resume software package into an online resume creation system via BrightRays and The Cookbook. The Right Resume is but one example of a garden variety PC software application that assists a user in creating a resume. The Right Resume is primarily concerned with providing a comprehensive job search tool that allows the user to track appointments and potential employers, and to generate cover letters, etc. BrightRays is an exemplary online resume

repository that distributes a user's resume to popular web search engines. There is no suggestion or motivation to combine The Right Resume with BrightRays and the Cookbook to provide an online resume creation system that allows a user to dynamically change the style of the online resume in the manner claimed by claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply BrightRays to Right Resume, providing Right Resume the benefit of an online (Web/HTML) resume creation method for greater user convenience (i.e., at a lab, or kiosk where all that is required is an Internet connection and browser for viewing/printing, etc.). BrightRays would also provide Right Resume the benefit of extending its database to hold and index user content/design data, for more efficient indexing, processing, and searching."

The Examiner makes no mention of how BrightRays and Right Resume would suggest or motivate one skilled in the art to develop an online resume creation system that allows a user to dynamically change the style of the resume in the manner claimed by claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46. Indeed, applying BrightRays to Right Resume, as suggested by the Examiner, suggests uploading a resume file from the user's PC to the BrightRays server, and then distributing the resume via BrightRays network.

Based on the reasoning above, Applicants respectfully submit that because there is no suggestion, teaching or motivation that would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Right Resume, BrightRays and the Cookbook in the manner claimed by claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46, claims 1, 12, 23, 38, 44, 45 and 46 are patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-24, 26-41 and 43-46 are allowable over the cited reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and

allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

June 20, 2005

Date

/Joyce Tom/ Reg. No. 48,681

Joyce Tom

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 48, 681

(650) 493-4540